Applicants note that the claim is in proper form, and does not raise the question of how many statutory classes are claimed. The storage medium storing a control program causes a computer to implement functions of the system. The structural limitations in the body of the claim further define the system in which the functions are implemented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 3-7 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Furst (U.S. Patent No. 6,297,819) in view of Yates et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,586). In the February 16, 2006 Amendment, Applicants amended claims 3, 6, and 9 to define the translation instructing banner as a non-programmed conversion instructing banner.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that the non-programmed "translation" (Applicants assume the Examiner is referring to "conversion") instructing banner is disclosed by item 116 of Figure 1, and described at col. 4, lines 40-41. Applicants again submit that neither the Figure itself or the description of item 116 suggest a *non-programmed* conversion instructing banner as claimed. Rather, item 116 is a component application tool. The component tools monitor a user while the user is browsing the web, and enables a user to obtain and interact with context-sensitive services and information based on the user's browsing activity (see col. 1, lines 55-67). Further, the application tools run on the user system itself. Thus, there is no suggestion of a non-programmed conversion instructing banner in Furst. Indeed, Furst teaches that the component application tools operate as a *program embedded in the client* (see col. 2, lines 29-30). In detail, Furst discloses that the discussion tool 116, as a particular example of the

component application tool, operates as a program which runs on the user computer 120 (see col. 8, line 49 - col. 10, line 54, and particularly col. 9, line 9, and col. 11, lines 65-67).

Applicants also again submit that the "banner" is not a program, but an image included in a web page (HTML file) which a user is browsing, that is, serving only as a button for a "conversion implementing request." Accordingly, the "banner" cannot run on the user system itself to monitor the user. Instead of the "banner", the browser recognizes the click of the banner and accesses a linked web site.

In addition, a conversion instructing banner in the claimed invention is arranged in contents (webpage) in the contents server, whereas the Application tool page is not arranged in the web browser window (see Fig. 1). Further, the "blower extensions" recited in the Furst's reference are known for allowing developers to provide easy access to their browser enhancements by adding elements (like an Explorer Bar) to the default user interface. This feature enables developers to create Explorer Bars and add entries into the standard context menus. This feature also allows developers to add entries into the Tools menu and buttons to the toolbar. This argument was not addressed by the Examiner in the Response to Arguments section starting at page 5 of the Office Action.

In the February 16, 2006 Amendment, Applicants argued that the Examiner maintains that Furst describes a conversion fee charging processing feature citing col. 10, lines 26-28. However, this section of Furst describes only a subscription feature allowing a user to subscribe to (join) a discussion group. There is no mention of conversion fees or a charging system in Furst. As such, Applicants argued that one of ordinary skill in the art would have no reason to

3

look to Yates for usuage history and accrued charges. In view of a subscription process not being like a conversion fee charging system, should the application not be passed to issue, Applicants kindly requested that the Examiner further discuss how this feature is disclosed by Furst.

The Examiner, in this Office Action states that Yates was applied for this feature, and that the motivation to combine the references would be to collect revenue, as well as providing discounts for subscriptions to the most frequent users, thereby stimulating their usage time and profit.

Applicants still maintain that the Examiner has not provided the motivation in the references themselves for the combination. That is, Furst does not disclose or suggest conversion fees or a charging system. Yates does not suggest charging to (join) a discussion group or anything similar. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination was based on improper hindsight in view of Applicants' own disclosure.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.